

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ.)

ಗಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಎರಡಾವರ್ತಿ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವಾಡಿ ಹತ್ತು ಹತ್ತು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಂತೆ ದಂಡ ತೆತ್ತು ನಂತರ ಈಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ರೈಲ್ವೆ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಲಾರ್ ಬಹದ್ದೂರ್ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳವರು ಮೊನ್ನೆ ರೈಲ್ವೆ ಬಡ್ತಿ ಟನ್ನು ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಒಂದನೆಯ ತರಗತಿ ಗಾಡಿಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಭಾರತಾದ್ಯಂತವೂ ಮೊದಲು ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂದೂ, ಅನಂತರ ಈ ಎರಡನೆಯ ತರಗತಿ ಗಾಡಿಗಳನ್ನೂ ವಜಾಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತ ಕಡೆಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಒಂದೇ ತರಗತಿ ಗಾಡಿಗಳು ಓಡುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲೆಯವರೆಗೂ ನಮಗೆ ಒಂದನೆಯ ತರಗತಿ ಗಾಡಿಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೋ ಅಲ್ಲವೋ ತನಕ ಒಂದನೆಯ ತರಗತಿ ರೇಖುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿ. ಅನಂತರ ಅದನ್ನೂ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿದ ನಂತರ ಎಲ್ಲೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಈ ಎರಡನೆಯ ತರಗತಿ ಗಾಡಿಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆಯೋ ಅರೇಖನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿ, ಅಷ್ಟೇನಾಕು. ನಮಗೆ ಇಂಥ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ತರಗತಿಯನ್ನೂ ಇರಬೇಕಾದ್ದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದೂ ಇದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವಾದುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Regarding officers the M.S.R. will make necessary changes when it is necessary and so we need not enter into that question at present. Regarding the charges calculated by some Hon'ble friends and accepted in the Legislative Council, it was this. For I Class it is Re. 0-2-3, for air-conditioned travel Re.0-3-3 for II class Re.0-1-4. Now double First Class has been provided, that means Re. 0-4-6 is being spent per mile. When I Class goes, the highest class will generally mean the Second Class. Generally Inter Class also which will be ten pies or eleven pies per mile. So, double Second Class means Re.0-2-8. But one Second Class which will be normally Re. 0-1-3 and *plus* this 3 annas would mean Re. 0-4-3 while you are spending Re. 0-4-6 now. So, we will be having less expenditure because air-conditioned travel is almost ruled out in Mysore State. As I have already said, it is found equitable to provide 3 annas and the Hon'ble members of the Legislative Council have accepted and I have commended it for the acceptance of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the amendments made to the Mysore Ministers' Salaries and Allowances (Amendment) Bill, 1953,

by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the amendment to clause 3 adopted by the Council to the following effect, namely, for the words “two annas” wherever they occur, the words “three annas” shall be substituted, be agreed to.”

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE LEGISLATURE SALARIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1953

Motion to consider.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I beg to move:

“That the amendments made to the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1953, by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration.”

This also has been amended on the same principle which I described and I commend this for the acceptance of this Hon'ble House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

“That the amendments made to the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1953, by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration.”

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuvekere).—I oppose this Bill also on the same grounds as I opposed the previous Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the amendments made to the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1953, by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:

“That the amendments to clauses 4 and 5 adopted by the Council to

the following effect, namely, for the words "two annas" wherever they occur, the words "three annas" shall be substituted, be agreed to."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE KOLAR GOLD FIELDS MUNICIPAL BILL, 1952.

Motion to withdraw.

Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—Sir, I beg to move :

"That leave be granted to withdraw the Mysore Kolar Gold Fields Municipal Bill, 1952, as reported by the Select Committee."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That leave be granted to withdraw the Mysore Kolar Gold Fields Municipal Bill, 1952, as reported by the Select Committee."

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—May I know the recommendation of the Select Committee and on what grounds the Select Committee has recommended that the Bill be withdrawn ?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—The Select Committee interviewed the representatives of the Mining Board and others interested in the matter and.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Copy of the report has been circulated ; it contains the Statement.

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—Yes, Sir. The Select Committee is of the opinion that the Bill as at present drafted needs to be altered materially. The Committee feels that the Bill will have to be re-drafted and the new Bill brought up for consideration of the two Houses of Legislature. Permission is therefore sought to withdraw the Bill.

Sri M. LINGANNA.—So, will the Government give an assurance to this House that by next session they will be bringing another Bill with necessary changes -- re-drafted?

Sri T. CHANNIAH.—We will try.

***Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM** (Jagalur).—Sir, being a Member of the Legislature

for the last quarter of a century and so far as my recollection goes, I think this is the first time that a Select Committee has recommended for the withdrawal of a Bill. I do not see any other instance. The Select Committee was appointed by this House to consider that Bill and the Select Committee, perhaps unanimously, has recommended that the Bill should be withdrawn. May I submit that such a recommendation is more or less a censure on the Government and censure on those who were responsible for the introduction or piloting this Bill before this House? It is not only a censure...

Mr. SPEAKER.—This is a Report of the Select Committee.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—That is what I am saying. The Bill was introduced before this House and the Members of this House took part in the debate and they approved almost the entire Bill and referred the Bill to be considered by the Select Committee.

1 P.M.

I do not know for what reason the Select Committee have recommended that the entire Bill be withdrawn. I do not know under what circumstances the Select Committee took this extreme step. These reasons must be given to this House by the gentlemen or by the Member who presided over the committee meetings. The Hon'ble Minister in charge of the Bill just now explained that it was necessary to consult the Mining Authorities and the Local Boards. But why did not the Government consult them before they sponsored the Bill? Was it not their duty to have consulted them before bringing in the bill before the House? That is a serious omission on their part. On the other hand I can say that this is the kind of responsibility with which they have introduced the Bill before the House. It is the duty of the Government to consider all consequences that would accrue. But they did not do so. They introduced the Bill without taking into consideration local conditions, without consulting the Mining Authorities or the Local Boards or the local people. It is a sad confession. The other day I remarked that whenever a Bill is introduced, before this

*Asterisk indicates that the speech has not been revised by the Member concerned.